REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested. Claims 1-14 and 16-26 are currently pending and stand rejected. Applicant has amended claims 1-7, 9-10, 14, 16, 18, and 21. No new matter has been added. The foregoing amendment and the following remarks place this application in condition for allowance or, in the alternative, in better form for appeal. Entry of this Amendment is therefore respectfully requested.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for his suggestions in the telephonic interview on October 25, 2004. Applicant has amended the claims to incorporate the Examiner's suggestions and respectfully requests allowance based on these changes.

§ 102 rejections

Claims 1, 3, 9, and 12-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by EP 0 684 356 ("EP '356"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In view of the Examiner's suggestions, Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to clarify that the drive transfer device engages with and disengages from the output element to operably connect and disconnect the gear wheel from the output element. EP '356 fails to show a device where the drive transfer device disengages from the output element because, as shown in Figure 19, the cam 7 (which the Examiner asserts is the claimed output element) is physically integrated with the elastic member 19 (which the Examiner asserts is the claimed drive transfer device). This physical integration makes it impossible for the cam 7 to ever disengage from the elastic member 19 (col. 14, lines 12-33). EP '356 therefore fails to disclose claims 1, 3, 9, and 12-20, and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 14 and 16-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,697,237 to Dilger et al. ("Dilger"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In view of the Examiner's suggestions, Applicant has amended independent claim 14 to clarify that the drive transfer device engages with and disengages from the output element. Dilger fails to disclose the claimed invention because the ball bearings 32 (which the Examiner asserts is the same as the claimed drive transfer device) are always engaged with the turning lever 11 (which the Examiner asserts is the same as the claimed output element). The ball bearings 32 in

Dilger only move out of arresting openings 32 in a driver fork 19 (which the Examiner asserts is the same as the claimed stop device) if torque applied to the turning lever 11 exceeds a predetermined value, but the ball bearings 32 constantly stay engaged to the turning lever 11 and never disengage from the turning lever 11, regardless of the relative position of the driver fork 19 and the turning lever 11 (see, e.g., col. 4, lines 21-34). Dilger therefore does not anticipate claims 14 and 16-20, and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

§ 103 rejections

Claims 1-7, 9, 10, 12 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dilger in view of EP '356. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As explained above, the amended claims recite that the drive transfer device engages with and disengages from the output element, and neither Dilger nor EP '356 show this configuration. Thus, combining Dilger with EP '356 still fails to teach a system where the drive transfer device engages with the output element to operably connect the output element to a gear wheel and where the drive transfer device disengages from the output element to operably disconnect the output element from the gear wheel. The Office Action therefore fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to claims 1-7, 9, 10, 12 and 13, and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dilger et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,518,181 to Yamada ("Yamada"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 8 depends on patentable claim 1 and is therefore patentable for the reasons explained above. Adding Yamada to Dilger still fails to suggest the claimed invention because Yamada only shows a resiliently biased pin 76 that stays constantly engaged with a rotary disk 62 (see, e.g., Figure 19). Thus, Yamada also fails to show any drive transfer device that disengages from an output element. The Office Action therefore fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to claim 8, and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that claims 11 and 21-26 contain allowable subject matter. As noted above, however, all of the amended claims are distinguishable over the cited references.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Applicant believes that no additional fees are necessary, however, the Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-1482 in the name of Carlson, Gaskey & Olds for any additional fees or credit the account for any overpayment.

Respectfully submitted,

Anna M. Shih, Reg. No. 36,372
Carlson, Gaskey & Olds
400 W. Maple Road, Ste. 350
Birmingham, MI 48009
(248) 988-8360

Dated: October 26, 2004

N:\Clients\MERITOR\P01179\PATENT\Amendment 3 16 04 Office Action.DOC

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE

I hereby certify that this amendment is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, (703) 872-9306, on October 26, 2004.

Beth A Beard

Beth A Beard